YEAR END SUMMARY
2022-2023
MASTER OF ARTS IN COUNSELING

Program Director's Note

       As a rule, I have had the pleasure of formulating a report with the kind and wonderful assistance of our MAC team (Dr. Kim Baldwin, Dr. Denise Houser, and myself), as well as numerous individuals both within the university and those outside the university, such as site supervisors, who share how the program has fared over the year. However, this year Dr. Baldwin is heading the work of pulling together the information and developing the report for review by the MAC faculty before it is published. This report is about CACREP standards and evaluations but it is a story of the how this program has impacted the lives of our students and graduates. It tells of areas we need to address and how we will do so. It sets a benchmark for the coming year.

       This report also will demonstrate the impact of the site visit and the CACREP board's comments as we sought to adjust to areas that were noted to us as needing a more complete response. We were thankful to be given an 8-year re-accreditation from CACREP. As a reader of this report, you may not be able to grasp the amount of time and energy that goes into its making, but I hope you will find that we are making every effort to provide our students a quality of education and counselor preparation that is at a level above area schools or those found online.

       My thanks to the administration of LCU for their continued support of the MAC program, Library Services, IT, maintenance, and environmental services as each provides resources and assistance in making our classes work. Thanks as well to the MAC team, Seminary faculty, Board of Advisors, Site Supervisors, and a special thanks to our students and their families for investing into the work of becoming a counselor.

C. Nolan Thomas, Ph.D., D. Min., LCPC
MAC Program Director
The Seminary at Lincoln Christian University

This report is based on the Program Evaluation Plan and follows its outline. In order to keep this report at a manageable length, various documents will be inserted as "icons" so that if you seek fuller details, you may click on the Icon and it will open the full document. The Program Evaluation Plan can be read in detail by clicking the icon below.

Program Evaluation
Plan 05.16.2022.docx

STUDENT DATA

The first set of data in our evaluation is data provided to us by students. There are two sources included. **Best Practice Audits** are a written or verbal review conducted by course professors on the last night of each class. The course professor reviews the student input, analyzes its merit for integration into the course, and creates a plan for incorporation. These reports are routed to the Program Director. Students also complete **LCU Course Evaluation Reports** at the end of each class via Canvas (our LMS) and the results are provided to the individual faculty and the program director for review.

Best Practice Audits
At the conclusion of each class, the students are invited to share their thoughts on the class in terms of what they liked, what they thought was less helpful, and what ideas they have to offer to improve the class. This is done either in written format or by discussion. A report of these items is submitted to the program director.

Findings:
Note below the changes for core classes as based on the Best Practice Audits:

Course	Proposed Change(s)
COUN 601 – Research and Evaluation in Counseling	Not available.
COUN 602 – Basic Counseling Techniques	• More role plays incorporating specific microskills will be included. • Lectures will be edited to remove topics covered extensively in other classes to make room for more role plays in class. • Written instructions for assignments will be made clearer.
COUN 662 – Psychopathology	Quiz #3 will be replaced with a quiz in case study format.
COUN 663 – Major Theories of Counseling	Will replace Stone & Duke text with Entwistle text.
COUN 666 – Developmental Psychology	Handout summarizing developmental milestones will be provided to students.
COUN 667 – Test and Measures for Counseling	No changes
COUN 668 – Group Theories and Practice	• Change in assignment due dates to Saturday night instead of Fridays.

	• Allow 15 minutes discussion time for groups to decide their project selection.
COUN 730 – Neuroscience	This course did not meet this year since it was just added as a core course last year and was not yet required by any student.
COUN 751 – Career Development Counseling	• Incorporate practicing career counseling with classmate • Add creating a career center as a class project
COUN 760 – Multicultural Counseling	• Move assignment due dates to midnight. • Post where students go for their Ethnographic Observation and Research paper so others can connect with them to talk about their experiences. • Include grounding exercise after Rwanda movie. • Provide an explanation for the purpose of viewing the violence in the Rwanda movie.
COUN 770 – Integration of Psychology and Theology	• Provide more clarity on the assignments • Consider adding more visuals
COUN 772 – Introduction to Traumatology	• Will look into replacing the Forbes text, as students tended not to complete the reading in it and there are probably more engaging texts available that cover the same material. • Will consider making the paper shorter or revamping instructions. • Will examine and revise assignment instructions as needed.
COUN 804 – Family Systems Counseling	• Revise pop quizzes to include broader concepts. • Provide handout with summary points for each major theory. • Let students know that there may be tough information that comes up in the role play.
COUN 807 – Substance Abuse and Addictions Counseling	• Attempt to find a guest speaker who has dealt with addictions. • Try to find more up-to-date counseling videos on this topic.
COUN 810 – Ethical and Legal Issues for Counselors and Other Christian Leaders	• Provide more discussion on advocacy scenarios. • Consider having a guest speaker on advocacy/social justice.

Proposal:
Professors will be reminded at the beginning of Fall 2023 of the changes they indicated they would be making in each course as noted above. Identified changes will be reviewed at the end of the upcoming academic year with each faculty member providing artifacts to support the changes made.

LCU Course Evaluation Reports
The university provides survey response scores from the students to the program director and to each course professor for their own course. Course evaluations are sent online via each Canvas course for students to complete. The percentage of those who responded to the survey was an aggregate of 52% for the year. This is slightly higher than last year's 42% return rate. This provides a look from about half of the student body. The class with the lowest return rate had a 26% return rate and the class with the highest return rate had a 100% return rate. Scores for each area are calculated as follows:

Course: calculated as an average of questions #11 (My responsibilities in this course were clear), #13 (The grading for this course was fair), and #17 (This was an excellent course).

Instructor: reported on evaluation spreadsheet as "Professor Average."

Learning: reported on evaluation as #12 [The assignments were well-designed (meaning they helped me learn, allowed my instructor to measure my learning or both)].

Overall Average: reported on evaluation spreadsheet as "Overall Average (excluding workload)."

Program averages are as follows for the three areas as based on a 1-5 scale with five being high.

Findings:

Area	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
Course	4.4	4.3	3.8	4.2
Instructor	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.6
Learning	4.4	4.6	4.0	4.3
Overall Average	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.4

Proposal:
A review of the course evaluation scores and student comments was done. Averages for all four areas exceed last year's averages. Two courses received scores in all four areas that were above the MAC faculty average in each area: COUN 807 and COUN 810. This professor was commended for their efforts. Most courses received comments that were of a mixed variety with no consistent feedback to inform specific changes. One course received more than one comment about organizational/clarity issues and technology issues. This professor has been made aware of the feedback.

FACULTY DATA

The second set of data in our evaluation plan is data generated by the faculty. There are five sources included. The **Pre-Practicum Exam** is completed by students who are preparing to enter a practicum experience. This test is given each fall and spring. This is aggregate data that addresses student knowledge in the areas of basic counseling techniques, major counseling theories, psychopathology, and ethics. The **Professional Disposition Form (PDF)** report is developed by the faculty in a review that occurs at the end of each eight-week term. The MAC faculty discuss each student and evaluate each student's development in regards to professional disposition. This report provides aggregate data of these results. **Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**, which align with both LCU and CACREP program student learning outcomes, are student learning outcomes that the MAC faculty have chosen to represent the progression and evaluation of student knowledge and student skills. KPI are evaluated in aggregate (**KPI/Student Learning Outcomes: aggregate**) and individual (**KPI/Student Learning Outcomes: individual**) tracking form. Note: In past Year End Summaries we provided results from Ongoing Assessment Submissions (OAS). Ongoing Assessment Submissions were designed to allow the ability to track individual progress in the program. We have now transitioned that process over to the **KPI/Student Learning Outcomes** process; therefore, the OAS tracking has been deleted to avoid redundancy.

Pre-Practicum Exam
Prior to being allowed to begin their practicum experience, each student is required to pass the Minimum Competency Evaluation (MCE; a process completed in COUN 602 Basic Counseling Techniques that assesses the adequacy of the students' counseling interview skills) and the pre-practicum exam (which assesses students' knowledge). The MCE is tracked by the professor of COUN 602 and Clinical Training Coordinator. The pre-practicum exam assesses the students' knowledge based on the four prerequisite classes: Major Theories (COUN 663), Basic Counseling Techniques (COUN 602), Psychopathology (COUN 662), and Ethics (COUN 810). There are 20 questions per area. The student is required to respond to 14 questions correctly in each content area to pass.

Findings:
Fall 2022 Pre-Practicum Review
Eleven students took the Fall pre-practicum exam. Seven passed all sections on the first attempt. All students passed the Basic Counseling Techniques and Psychopathology sections during their first attempt. Three students were required to re-take the Ethics portion and one student was required to re-take the Ethics and the Major Theories sections. All students who had to re-take any sections passed on their second attempt resulting in all students having passed the pre-practicum exam. Final average scores for the pre-practicum for this group was 68.27 out of 80 (85.3%).
Spring 2023 Pre-Practicum Review
Six students took the Spring pre-practicum exam. Five passed all sections on the first attempt. All students passed the Major Theories, Basic Counseling Techniques, and Ethics sections during their first attempt. One student was required to re-take the Psychopathology portion but passed on the second attempt resulting in all students having passed the pre-practicum exam. Final average scores for the pre-practicum for this group was 66.17 out of 80 (82.7%).

Student performance for each section was analyzed. Specific areas of concern in each category include:

Major Theories: existential therapy techniques, REBT therapy techniques, and Adlerian therapy.
Psychopathology: concept of reliability.
Ethics: imposition of a counselor's values on a client, exceptions to confidentiality, bartering for services, sound referral processes.

Proposal: The instructors of these courses will review the questions missed by over 60% of the students in each section. The instructor of the specific course will modify their course to strengthen the learning material based on the reflection of these missed questions.

Professional Disposition

Each quarter the MAC faculty meet to discuss each student in terms of their meeting or not meeting the five areas the MAC faculty have defined as developing a professional disposition in counseling. If a student receives an "unmet" in any area, the student's academic advisor meets with the student to discuss the concern and determine a remediation plan. The areas and definitions are as follows:

Dispositional area	Definition/Example
Psychological Fitness	Self-aware, self-care, empathy, aware of own motives and values, aware of unfinished emotional business and or mental health concerns and work toward resolving them
Cultural Sensitivity	Embrace diversity, honor others as worthy of respect as being made in the image of God, values service to oppressed and disenfranchised
Ethical Soundness	Honest and genuine
Dependability	Reliable, timely, accessible
Flexibility	Open to feedback, able to tolerate ambiguity, able to adjust to changes

Findings:
Out of a student body of 50 students, only one was identified with an unmet area in the PDF (area 4: Dependability). This occurred during the 2nd quarter and has not been a concern since. This represents about 2% of the students. If a student has four "unmets" during their time in the program they may be dismissed from the program. All other students were mailed a thank you note for meeting standards at the end of the school year.

Proposal:
There does not appear to be enough data at this time to require a programmatic change.

KPI/Student Learning Outcomes: aggregate

As a part of the ongoing evaluation of the program, MAC faculty have selected a key performance indicator (KPI) of student learning in each of the eight core areas and in the clinical mental health counseling specialty area. These indicators are measured via multiple measures and over multiple points of time. These KPI are also linked to our Student Learning Outcomes and the Institutional Learning Outcomes.

Findings/ Proposals:
Please see the Master Standards Document 2022-2023 for a detailed review. Although most standards were met, this document contains specific plans for modifying the course given the outcome of the measures.

Master Standards
Document. 2022-202:

KPI/Student Learning Outcomes: individual
Besides tracking the overall program scores for each KPI standard, the program also tracks each individual student's scores on each KPI as they take the class where the KPI is placed. Scores are kept in a Google spreadsheet only accessible to the counseling professors. Should an issue arise meeting a KPI, the faculty member (at their discretion) will communicate remediation plans with the student via email, meeting, or Student Progress Form (SPF). If a SPF is deemed appropriate, a copy is provided to the student and a copy is placed in the student's MAC file.

Findings:
Out of a current enrollment of 50 students tracked across 39 different specific KPIs, there were only 8 occurrences of a student failing to meet a particular standard.

Proposal:
Faculty will continue to review which standards are considered KPI and track students' success in these areas.

CLINICAL TRAINING DATA
This section reviews assessments on how students perform in the practice of counseling and its related processes, including reports from clinical training site supervisors regarding their evaluation of the students' performances, as well as assessment of supervision and sites from the counselors-in-training. This section will also review the Clinical Training Component evaluation, in which students assess the clinical training portion of their experience in the program.

Evaluation of Students by Site Supervisors
As the practicums and internships are the venue for students to apply their counseling knowledge and skills, feedback regarding their success is valuable for the program. We rely on the observations, evaluations, and input of the site supervisors. All site supervisors have a minimum of two years' experience in their field and hold a terminal license as a mental health provider (LCPC, LCSW, or LCP). Most site supervisors have had multiple years of experience as a supervisor in mental health care. Each supervisor is provided with a scoring tool which covers the following areas: interpersonal/general factors, clinical skills, the conceptualization process, multicultural competencies, personalization/countertransference, diagnosis and test administration, and professional development. Evaluations are based on a 1-5 scale with five as high. The descriptive anchors for the rating state that "1" does not meet expectations, "2" *may* require a remediation plan and falls below acceptable standards to pass the course on the final evaluation, "3" meets expectations, "4" indicates a level of performance that is substantial both in quantity and quality, and "5" well exceeds expectations and is not necessarily expected at this

level of training. (Evaluation forms provide additional anchor descriptions to guide supervisory evaluations.)

Findings:
For practicums, fall 2022 final evaluation scores averaged 4.17. Spring 2023 final evaluation scores averaged 4.17. The lowest average scores achieved were 3.5 on item 19 [Explores with the client contradictions within and/or between client behaviors, cognitions, and/or affect] and 3.63 on item 31 [Completes case reports and records punctually, correctly, and conscientiously].
For internships, since some students completed their internships in the fall semester, final (2nd semester of internship) evaluations for the students' final semesters were combined from the fall and spring semesters and evaluated. Final evaluation scores for 2022-2023 academic year averaged 4.51. The lowest average scores achieved in the final evaluations were 3.60 on item 54 [Interprets tests appropriately] and 3.80 on item 53 [Administers test(s) according to the procedures in the test manual]. Both of these items address testing ability, which likely reflects that most students take the COUN 667 Test and Measures course during their last 8-week block.

Proposal:
Each of the low-scoring items during the final practicum evaluation and the final semester of internship achieved beyond the "meets" requirement (3.5 & 3.63 and 3.60 & 3.80, respectively). No changes appear to be necessary at this time.

Evaluation of Site Supervisors
Students provide a valuable source of information about the learning process by assessing the supervision they receive from their clinical training site supervisors. The rating scale is based on a 1-5 scale with five as high. Since sites host both practicum and internship students, scores for site supervisor evaluations have been combined. If site supervisors receive low scores from more than one student, then that site/supervisor is not recommended for future students. If a site supervisor receives exceptionally low scores from a student, the clinical training coordinator meets with the student to discuss the situation to determine if the site/supervisor should be pulled from our recommended list immediately.

*Findings***:**
For both the fall 2022 and spring 2023, the overall average supervisor score was 4.86. The lowest score was a 3.0, scored by one supervisor on item I.5 [My supervisor was accessible when needed outside of supervision time]. As this is an acceptable rating, it was determined that no action was needed.
In both the fall and spring semesters, two items scored the lowest with an average score of 4.72. These were items I.3 [My supervisor kept regular appointments] and I.5 [My supervisor was accessible when needed outside of supervision time] on the evaluation. It is noted that although these were the low-scoring items, the scores were very acceptable.

Proposal:
As noted in the findings above, all site supervisors performed satisfactorily in 2022-2023. The faculty will continue to provide introductory training to site supervisors regarding basic supervisory concepts, the role of evaluation, and specific guidelines pertaining to the process at LCU. The LCU Clinical Training Coordinator will also contact the sites twice per month. This process has a record of producing above-average supervisory experiences in the majority of cases.

Evaluation of Sites
Students provide feedback about their overall satisfaction with their training sites. Since sites host both practicum and internship students, scores for site evaluations have been combined. This information is used to help guide recommendations for sites. The rating scale is also based on a 1-5 scale with five as high.

Findings:
For the fall 2022-spring 2023 year, sites achieved an average overall rating of 4.51 for practicums and internships combined. The lowest site score was 3.14. This site was unable to provide the intern with enough clients to obtain the hours needed to complete the internship despite several steps taken to assist the site to find ways to do so. The student will not be returning to the site and will complete internship at another site. This site will not be recommended for future interns, although it may be considered if a student wishes to complete a practicum there. All other sites scored above a 3.5, which is considered an acceptable score.

*Proposal***:**
Sites overall rated well. In the case in which the student scored the site lower, we were made aware of the situation and worked to deal with it. This is a sound indicator that our clinical training supervision stays aware of current trainee concerns. We will continue to manage site application processes to ensure successful site placements and we will continue to have open channels of communication between trainees, group supervisors, and the clinical training coordinator in order to work with situations before they become unmanageable.

Evaluation of the Clinical Training Component of the MAC Program
The program also strives to incorporate feedback about how the entire clinical training portion of the program is perceived by the students. This evaluation assesses the process of obtaining a site and understanding procedures, as well as the process of the weekly group supervision. Again, the scale is 1-5 with five being high.

Findings:
For practicums and internships combined, the combined fall 2022 and spring 2023 average score was 4.74. Lowest average scored item was item 4 (4.61) [I received adequate support and guidance from the Clinical Training Coordinator and /or the Clinical Training Coordinator Assistant in general regarding all requirements and paperwork.]. This year, the clinical training coordinator position transitioned from one faculty member to another, who is new to the duties of the position. Although this was

the lowest scoring item, the overall score was still acceptable. It should be noted that the highest scoring item was item 10 (4.87) [I had adequate opportunity to discuss multicultural concerns in group supervision]. This is significant in that this item was the lowest scoring item for the past two years and specific discussions were had within the MAC faculty meetings about how to improve student experience in this area. When individually evaluating each faculty group supervisor, overall faculty ratings ranged from 4.67 to 4.82.

Proposal:
Overall, scores indicate that the clinical training process and group supervision is going well.   Incorporating multicultural concerns has been a specific topic to cover in group supervision, as this was the lowest scoring item on the evaluations for the last three years. Given the improvement in this area, and the experience gained by the new clinical training coordinator, no changes are recommended at this time.

POST-GRADUATE DATA

Graduate Survey
Each year the recent graduates are contacted one semester post-graduation in order to obtain NCE scores, employment information, and comments regarding what they think would help the program improve. This school year, the graduates (2021-2022) were contacted weekly during the Spring semester (2023) requesting that they fill out the graduate survey. There were 15 graduates for the 2021-2022 school year, and we had three responses. This represents a 20% return rate.

Findings:
Out of the three students who responded, two are employed within the counseling field and one is currently disabled. The two employed students provided their passing scores and comments regarding the LCU program. When asked how LCU could improve the counseling program, they answered:
1. I believe that incorporating more work on specific interventions during group supervision could be ideal.
2. More training in working with sexual abuse and sexual abuse perpetrators

Proposal:
The MAC faculty reviewed the responses. It was decided that no changes would be made based on these recommendations for the following reasons.
1. Group supervision focuses on broader bases of counseling, such as counseling theories and counselor-client relationships and interactions. Specific interventions are best addressed in specific courses.
2. Working with sexual abuse and sexual abuse perpetrators is a specialty area in counseling. As such, these topics are addressed in our elective (COUN 725 Complex Trauma). A brief introduction to this area is provided in our core course (COUN 772 Introduction to Traumatology).

Graduate Employer/Supervisor Survey

The Graduate Survey is sent to the employers of our students who graduated in 2021-2022. There were 15 graduates in the 2021-2022 class, and we received one response from an employer/supervisor. This represents a 6% return rate. We are unsure how to improve this return rate. At this point, the employers are sent multiple requests and reminders. Employers/supervisors are asked to rate our graduates on 17 different questions related to six areas: therapeutic skills, assessment, consultation, ethics, integration, and work with multicultural clients and issues. Also, they are asked to comment on what they see as the strengths and weaknesses of the training program.

Findings:

Of the one survey reported, the graduate received a 5 in all applicable categories. (rating is 1-5, with 5 as excellent). For the categories of "Use of group therapeutic skills," "Demonstrates skills in areas of the practical application of evaluation and research," and "Ability to integrate counseling and Biblical worldview, either conceptually or practically," the employer wrote "Not Applicable."

Comments from the employer/supervisor included the following:

1. In referring to strengths of the program, they stated, "Openness to feedback; good foundational work"

2. In referring to weaknesses of the program, they stated, "Unable to answer since student is my only interaction with LCU"

Proposal:

After review by the faculty, there were no changes to be made to the program based on the Graduate Employer/Supervisor Survey. Further discussion is needed to determine if there is a better way to obtain this information. One possibility is to digitalize the feedback form into a version that takes 5 minutes or less. This will be decided next fall in time to implement any changes by spring 2024.

National Counselor Exam Graduate Scores

Like the other elements of the post-Graduate data, we rely on graduate responses in this area. We received four NCE score reports. All reports provided a complete scoring report on both the NCE CACREP Areas and Counselor Work Behavior Areas. The findings from each student's scores are listed below.

Findings:

Student One: Received a 127 in CACREP areas and Counselor Work Behavior Areas with a passing score requirement of 84.

Student Two: Received a 126 in CACREP areas and Counselor Work Behavior Areas with a passing score requirement of 93.

Student Three: Received a 124 in CACREP areas and Counselor Work Behavior Areas with a passing score requirement of 84.

Student Four: Received a 110 in CACREP areas and Counselor Work Behavior Areas with a passing score requirement of 95.

Typically, graduate NCE results are compared with each student's entry CPCE results. Unfortunately, three of these students entered when the CPCE was shut down due to COVID. At this same time our program switched to using the CECE in place of the CPCE as the entry exam. As a result, no entry test was completed on these three students. One of these four entered while we were still using the CPCE. The CPCE contains 20 questions in each category of which 17 are scored. The comparison between beginning CPCE and ending NCE scores is provided below:

CACREP Area	CPCE Score	NCE Score	Difference
Orientation and Ethics	41%	80%	+41%
Social and Cultural Diversity	41%	71%	+30%
Human Growth and Development	47%	86%	+39%
Career Counseling	29%	55%	+26%
Counseling and Helping Relationships	76%	76%	+0%
Group Counseling and Group Work	53%	75%	+22%
Assessment and Testing	53%	58%	+5%
Research and Program Evaluation	35%	20%	-15%
Average Score	46.9%	65.125%	+18.225

Proposal:
All students who reported NCE scores reported passing. We are not personally aware of any students who have attempted to pass and did not succeed. While comparing entry to program against exiting the program, we are able to demonstrate growth in all areas from entry to licensure; however, it is only for one student. We cannot make program changes based on such limited data. However, it is noted that the area of Research and Program Evaluation was also the lowest area in last year's summary report. Therefore, we plan to continue to track these results to determine if this is an ongoing trend. We also plan to meet with the adjunct faculty assigned to this course to discuss the course, the standards, and methods for reaching these goals. There was relatively little movement in the Helping Relationship area, which may be indicative of the kind of person who enters into the field. This occurred in last year's evaluation of entry and exit scores as well.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

In preparation for our reaccreditation, review of our site visit, and subsequent discussions, we have been taking specific steps to address our use of data about the "demographic characteristics of applicants, students, and graduates" (CACREP 2016 Standard Section 4, Standard B.2) to evaluate our program objectives and inform curricular/program improvement. Initial data about the demographics of enrolled students was provided to CACREP (see Self Study Addendum 2); however, we have expanded the evaluation of student demographic data to encompass application, admission, enrollment, and graduation.

Lincoln Christian
University Self-Study

In order to provide our students an experience that is as diverse as possible within the confines of our geographic limitations, we track racial/ethnic and gender demographic data on all applicants to the program and all graduates of the program. This has been recently implemented; therefore, we do not have multiple years of data to compare. Our enrollment services has put in place a system to track applicants beginning fall 2022.

We recognize that diversity occurs and should be valued/celebrated in a number of areas (such as, age, ability/disability, religion/spirituality, ethnicity/race, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, gender, indigenous heritage, national origin). We also recognize the cultural area in which we live. Consistent with LCU's tracking of demographic data, we have chosen to focus our tracking on two main diversity factors – race/ethnicity and gender.

Annual Applicant Student Demographic Data
Each end of academic year Enrollment Services provide the MAC faculty with data regarding the gender and race/ethnicity of applicants and those who enroll. The MAC faculty use this information to inform the annual plan for recruitment and enrollment. The plan is discussed with the Director of Enrollment.

Findings:
The gender and race/ethnicity data for the application and admissions process for our MAC students for the academic year 2022-2023 is as follows:

Numbers in columns are listed as Applications/Admissions.

	White	Black/African Am	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Two or more	Asian	TOTAL
Female	16/11/10	4/1/0	1/1/1	1/0/0	0/0/0	22/13/11
Male	4/1/1	1/1/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	1/1/0	6/3/1
Unknown	There were 6 applicants who did not declare gender on the app. None of these completed the application process. There were 2 female and 2 male applicants who did not complete the application process. Race/ethnicity is not known.					

NOTE: No applicants were rejected. Those not admitted either withdrew a submitted application or never submitted the application.

It appears that we admit approximately the same percentage of applicants for females (59%) vs. males (50%). Regarding race/ethnicity, during the admission process we admitted 100% of our Asian applicants, 0% of the multiracial applicants, 100% of the Hispanic/Latino/a applicants, 40% of the Black/African American applicants, and 75% of the White applicants. While the sample size for most of these groups is too small to inform a programmatic decision, the discrepancy between the retention of the White applicants (75%) and Black/African American applicants deserves attention.

Regarding the rate at which admitted students enroll, 85% of admitted female students enrolled, 33.3% of admitted male students enrolled. Fifty-five % of 20 admitted White students enrolled; 0% of 5 admitted Black students enrolled; 100% of 1 admitted Hispanic/Latino/a student enrolled; no multiracial students completed the application process; and 0% of the 1 admitted Asian student enrolled. Again, the sample size for most of these groups is too small to inform a programmatic decision; however, there continues to be a discrepancy between the percentage of White (55%) and Black (0%) students who have completed the application and admission process and then actually enroll in courses.

Proposal:
Since this information becomes available at the end of the academic year, no plan based on the 2022-2023 applicant data has been developed at this time. An initial discussion of these findings will take place between the MAC Program Director and the Director of Enrollment during the early summer months. This material will be reviewed in detail at the first MAC faculty meeting in Fall 2023 with a plan developed. The MAC Program Director will discuss the plan with the Director of Enrollment by September 2023 to create a collaborative plan.

Annual Enrolled Student Demographic Data
Regarding race/ethnicity, the following information was gathered from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/bloomingtoncityillinois,normaltownillinois,decatur cityillinois,lincolncityillinois,peoriacityillinois,springfieldcityillinois/SEX255221:

Racial Distribution Based on July 2020 Census information	Male	Female	African American Black	Alien/NR	Asian/ Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic Latino	Two or more	White
Bloomington	49.5%	50.5%	9.5%	N/A	8.5%	5.7%	4.5%	76.1%
Normal	47.3%	52.7%	11.9%	N/A	3.7%	6.3%	3.4%	80.1%
Decatur	47.3%	52.7%	23.1%	N/A	1.5%	2.8%	5.3%	69.2%
Lincoln	50.8%	49.2%	5.5%	N/A	0.9%	2.8%	4.1%	89.1%
Peoria	48.4%	51.6%	26.7%	N/A	6.5%	6.8%	5.8%	58.7%
Springfield	47.9%	52.1%	20%	N/A	3.2%	2.9%	4.6%	71.6%
Area Average	48.5%	51.5%	16.1%	N/A	4.1%	4.6%	4.6%	74.1%

Given we are located in an area that is Midwestern and fairly rural, we do not expect to match the racial and ethnic diversity levels of larger metropolitan locations. However, our goal is to match or exceed the diversity of our local communities.

Findings:
The gender and race/ethnicity data for our MAC students as presented in our most recent campus program review is as follows:

Year	Male	Female	African American/ Black	Alien/ NR	Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Two/or more	White	Not reported
2015/ 2016	7 14%	43 86%	8 16%	1 2%	0	0	0	41 82%	0
2016/ 2017	12 21%	46 79%	7 12%	0	1 2%	0	0	50 86%	0
2017/ 2018	22 30%	52 70%	9 12%	1 1%	2 3%	0	0	61 82%	1
2018/ 2019	21 33%	43 67%	2 3%	1 2%	2 3%	2 3%	0	57 89%	0
2019/ 2020	28 34%	55 66%	3 4%	1 1%	3 4%	3 4%	3 4%	70 84%	0
2020/ 2021	20 27%	53 73%	3 4%	2 3%	1 1%	5 7%	2 3%	59 81%	1
2021/ 2022	16 22%	58 78%	4 5%	1 1%	1 1%	4 5%	1 1%	63 85%	0
2022/ 2023	9 18%	41 82%	2 4%	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	0	43 86%	0
5-year average	18.8 27%	50 73%	2.8 4%	1.2 2%	1.6 2%	3.4 5%	1.2 2%	58.4 84%	0.2 0%

The students reported in this table represent total number of students enrolled in a year regardless of their having remained in the program the entire school year or not.

A comparison between our feeder cities and our gender and racial/ethnic distribution yields:

	Male	Female	African American/ Black	Alien/NR	Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Two/or more	White
Area average	48.5%	51.5%	16.1%	N/A	4.1%	4.6%	4.6%	74.1%
LCU 5-year average	27%	73%	4%	2%	2%	5%	2%	84%
Difference	-21.5%	+21.5%	-12.1%	N/A	-2.1%	+0.4%	-2.6%	+9.9%

Proposal:
We determined there is a significant need to focus on increasing the gender and racial/ethnic diversity of our students in the MAC program. We elected to focus initially on the racial/ethnic diversity of our students. Increasing racial/ethnic diversity aligns with our program objective 3 of aiming to develop counselors that "demonstrate the development of a counselor identity and

skills fit for working in an increasingly diverse world." It is our goal to create an environment that is welcoming to all, equips counselors to work with all populations, and provides growth from experiencing different world views. As a result, MAC faculty held focused discussions within group supervision and fall 1st quarter classes. The MAC program director then met with the Directors of Enrollment and Marketing. (See Diversity Discussion Meeting Enrollment and Marketing 11.30.2022).

 Diversity Discussion
Meeting Enrollment a

The marketing process was then reviewed during a follow up meeting on 05/02/2023 (See 5.2.23 Marketing) with specific plans discussed for targeted marketing.

5.2.23Marketing.docx

New efforts in marketing have already taken place and are scheduled for this summer as well. (Please see Marketing plan report 05.2023.)

 Marketing plan
 report 05.2023.docx

Additionally, we targeted marketing to possible feeder schools whose demographics offer a more diverse population than is currently reflected in the LCU program. The schools visited included Greenville University (Faith based institution), Eureka College (Faith-based institution), Illinois Wesleyan University (Non-faith-based institution), and Millikin University (Non-faith-based institution) and Western Illinois University (Non-faith-based institution).

Year	Male	Female	African American/ Black	Alien/ NR	Asian	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Two/or more	White	Not reported
LCU MAC 2022-2023	18%	82%	4%	2%	2%	6%	0	86%	0
Eureka	53%	47%	10%	0.8%	<1%	1%	1%	81%	3%
Greenville	56%	44%	12%	8.5%	<1%	6.6%	4%	67%	2%
Millikin	57%	43%	13%	3.9%	2%	4%	3%	69%	5%
Wesleyan	48%	52%	7%	2.8%	7.7%	9%	4%	70%	<1%
Western	47%	53%	21%	1.1%	1%	13%	3%	59%	3%

Demographic information for the institutions visited came from Collegefactual.com reflecting undergraduate statistics. These are compared to the 2022-2023 MAC student body.

Although school visits provide an opportunity to have our program promoted and provide awareness, there are usually few actual face-to-face conversations. However, it should be noted that of the personal discussions that came out of these visits, it appeared that this effort expanded our outreach to demographics that have a broader base than what is currently represented in our present program.

Annual graduate demographic review
Each year we seek to assess our success in retaining students representing the different demographic groups in the program. To assess retention rate of students in our tracked demographics, we compared aggregate data of those admitted to data of those who completed the program.

Findings:
Students graduating in May 2023 enrolled in the program in 2020-2021. Admission for the 2020-2021 academic year consisted of 20 out of 21 applicants, of whom 2 reported race/ethnicity as Black/African American, 1 reported as Hispanic/Latina, 16 reported as White, and 1 did not report. Fourteen admitted students reported their gender as female; six reported as male. There were nine graduates in 2023 who reported as 1 Black/African American, 8 White, 2 male, and 7 female.

	Admitted 2020-2021	Graduated 2023
Total	20	9 (45%)
Female/Male	14/6	7 (50%)/2 (33%)
Black/African American	2	1 (50%)
White	16	8 (50%)
Hispanic/Latina/o	1	0 (0%)
Not reported	1	0

Proposal:
In our review of applicants and graduates, it appears our retention rate is similar across racial/ethnic groups; however, our small amount of data suggests we do not retain male students as well as we do female. As noted above, the MAC faculty have elected to focus initially on the racial/ethnic diversity of our students.

RE-ACCREDITATION PROCESS

We are pleased and honored to announce that we received notice on February 22, 2023 that the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) reaffirmed our accreditation status with the specialty of Clinical Mental Health Counseling with the request of one progress report required in April 2024. The process involved an extensive review of self-study documents, a site review team's report, and our response to the site review team's report. We are thankful to the site reviewers' careful attention to their duty. This accreditation cycle runs through March 31, 2031.

Specifically, the April 2024 report is required to address CACREP 2016 Standard Section 4, Standard B and C. Addressing this component will also enhance our ability to meet the LCU Seminary MAC objective #3 (Demonstrate the development of a counselor identity and skills fit for working in an increasingly diverse world). The aim of this report will be to provide evidence that we are tracking demographic data of applicants, students, and graduates and using that data to inform program modifications. Please see the Demographic Data section above for further details of what we are implementing based on our recent review of the data.

We express our appreciation to the many people who helped us achieve this goal, including (but not limited to) our site supervisors, supportive administration, IT department, library staff, and advisory board. We emphasize that the success of our program also is supported by the dedicated students who spend many hard hours working toward their preparation in the field. It is for them and the clients they will serve that all these efforts are made.

SUMMARY

In sum, this document delineates our findings in each of the areas we track (student data, faculty data, clinical training data, post-graduate data, and demographic data) and how we plan to use these findings to improve our program. This document's information is reviewed at the first MAC faculty meeting of the fall semester so that we can verify that the changes we have noted have been put in place for the broader program, the clinical training portion of our program, and the individual courses. We appreciate your interest and welcome feedback. To provide program specific feedback, please contact the MAC Program Director at cnthomas@lincolnchristian.edu.